Journal of the American College of Cardiology Vol. 60, No. 6, 2012

Published by Elsevier Inc.

ISSN 0735-1097/$36.00

CORRESPONDENCE

Letters to the Editor

Clinical Value of Myocardial Contrast Delayed Enhancement With Multidetector Computed Tomography

***Abhishek Sharma, MD**
Saurav Chatterjee, MD

*Maimonides Medical Center
1016 50th Street, Apartment 2C
Brooklyn, New York 11219
E-mail: abhisheksharma4mamc@gmail.com

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2012.02.074

We read with great interest the article by Sato et al. (1) that evaluated the prognostic value of myocardial contrast delayed enhancement with 64-slice multidetector computed tomography (MDCT) after acute myocardial infarction. They should be commended for conducting the study elegantly. However, a few interesting points arise from the analysis that we believe may be pertinent and should be answered.

Because MDCT can detect peri-infarct tissue heterogeneity that can trigger ventricular arrhythmias (2), which are a common cause of morbidity and mortality in patients who have had a myocardial infarction. Did the authors make an attempt to evaluate and correlate peri-infarct heterogeneity with prognosis? Also, automated implantable cardioverter-defibrillators (AICDs) are known to improve the prognosis in a subset of patients who have had a myocardial infarction (3), so it would be interesting to know the AICD distribution among various tertiles and among event groups and whether the authors adjusted its distribution as a possible confounding factor.

Were patients with high levels of biomarkers that are known to be associated with poor prognosis and are highly correlated with delayed enhancement size (creatine kinase-myocardial band, troponin, poor left ventricular ejection fraction) treated more aggressively, or was any attempt made to standardize the therapy after hospital discharge?

Because the number of segments with transmural infarct (on the 17-segment model) is a strong and independent predictor of prognosis (4), it would be interesting to know if authors made an attempt to determine which is the better prognostic indicator: the number of segments involved or infarct size (e.g., multiple segments with subendocardial infarct versus few segments with transmural infarct).

Did the authors make any attempt to study the significance of calcium deposits in acute infarct detected on MDCT and its impact on prognosis?

MDCT is an excellent alternative in situations where magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is contraindicated and attributing to its improving resolution and reduced partial volume effect that results in a more accurate assessment of area amenable to revascularization, which might replace MRI in the future. However, the absence of a universally acceptable protocol for delayed imaging is a critical road block due to the time dependent nature of the contrast uptake. Another limitation is hyperenhancement of both acute and chronic infarct, which limit the role of delayed enhancement on multidetector computed tomography in patients with a history of myocardial infarction.

REFERENCES

1. Sato A, Nozato T, Hikita H, et al. Prognostic value of myocardial contrast delayed enhancement with 64-slice multidetector computed tomography after acute myocardial infarction. J Am Coll Cardiol 2012;59:730–8.
2. Schuleri KH, Centola M, George RT, et al. Characterization of peri-infarct zone heterogeneity by contrast-enhanced multidetector computed tomography: a comparison with magnetic resonance imaging. J Am Coll Cardiol 2009;53:1699–707.
3. Gregoratos G, Cheitlin MD, Conill A, et al. ACC/AHA guidelines for implantation of cardiac pacemakers and antiarrhythmia devices: executive summary—a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee on Pacemaker Implantation). Circulation 1998;97:1325–35.
4. Tarantini G, Razzolini R, Cacciavillani L, et al. Influence of transmurality, infarct size, and severe microvascular obstruction on left ventricular remodeling and function after primary coronary angioplasty. Am J Cardiol 2006;98:1033–40.

Reply

We thank Drs. Sharma and Chatterjee for their comments in regards to our recently published paper (1). A previous report demonstrated that multidetector computed tomography could detect peri-infarct tissue heterogeneity 6 months after myocardial infarction (MI) that could trigger ventricular arrhythmias (2). However, we could not detect peri-infarct tissue heterogeneity and calcium deposits of infarcts immediately after primary percutaneous coronary intervention. Acute MI is associated with myocardial edema during the acute phase (3), and therefore, this also may influence the extent of myocardial contrast delayed enhancement. We agree that automatic implantable cardioverter-defibrillators (AICDs) are known to improve the prognosis in a subset of patients who have had an MI, but only a few patients received AICD therapy in our study. There is a low incidence of sudden cardiac death in survivors of MI in Japan. During an average follow-up of 4.1 years, 1.2% of 4,122 consecutive patients with acute MI discharged from the hospital had sudden cardiac death (4). AICDs are implanted only in high-risk patients with cardiac dysfunction (left ventricular ejection fraction <40%), nonsustained ventricular tachycardia, and sustained ventricular tachycardia induced during an electrophysiological study.

The purpose of our study was to evaluate the clinical value of myocardial contrast delayed enhancement with multidetector computed tomography for predicting clinical outcome after acute MI. Therefore, our patients were treated with standard therapy after hospital discharge.

The number of left ventricular segments with transmural delayed enhancement has been shown to be a major factor for the